

University of Northern Iowa
UNI ScholarWorks

Documents - Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate

3-27-2000

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda, March 27, 2000

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright ©2000 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda, March 27, 2000" (2000). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 1094.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1094

This Agenda is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Summary of Faculty Senate Meeting 3/27/00

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for Press Identification
2. Comments from Chair McDevitt
3. Comments from Chair Kelly
4. Comments from Provost Podolefsky

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

740 Report of the Calendar Committee

Nelson moved (Utz seconded) to docket this for April 10 meeting.
Motion carried. Docketed as item 656.

741 Request for Changes to Policies for Graduating with Honors

Utz moved (Terlip seconded) to docket in regular order.
Motion carried. Docketed as item 657.

742 Request for Emeritus Status, Charles Strein, Department of Economics

Power moved (Ogbondah seconded) to docket in regular order.
Motion carried. Docketed as item 658.

743 Receive report of the Committee on Admission and Retention

Jurgenson moved (Terlip seconded) to docket in regular order.
Motion carried. Docketed as item 659.

NEW BUSINESS

Strategic Plan

Power moved (Nelson seconded) that the Senate invite the P & S Council and the Student Government Group to meet with us in a public hearing sometime before the end of the semester at which time our Strategic Planning Committee can report to the group. The President can explain to us his understanding of the plan as well as the Committee.

OLD BUSINESS

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Tabled to April 10 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Jurgenson moved (Kirmani seconded) to adjourn.

Motion to adjourn carried

Meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

**Minutes of the University Faculty Senate Meeting
March 27, 2000**

1554

PRESENT: Karen Couch Breitbach, David Christensen, Carol Cooper, Jim Jurgenson, Jim Kelly, SyedKirmani, Suzanne McDevitt, Lauren Nelson, Chris Ogbondah, Dan Power, Tom Romanin, Laura Terlip, Richard Utz, Shahram Varzavand, Barbara Weeg.

ABSENT: Kenneth Basom, Michael Blackwell, Bud Bowlin, Lyn Countryman, Katherine vanWormer

CALL TO ORDER: Chair McDevitt called the Senate to order at 3:18 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Varzavand moved (Terlip seconded) that the minutes of February 14 and February 28, 2000 be approved.

Minutes were approved with the following correction to February 14:

Page 5, under Report from the Budget Committee: The initial deadline for submission is **April 15**. (In future years the deadline is proposed to be April 1.)

The minutes were approved with the stated changes.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION: Jeff Scudder, Northern Iowan, and Andrew Wind, Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR McDEVITT:

Chair McDevitt deferred her comments till the next meeting in the interest of keeping the meeting to a reasonable length.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR KELLY:

Faculty Chair Kelly passed around a model of a new Request for Emeritus Status form. Senators were asked to look it over and be prepared to submit a new form to the Cabinet for approval after the next meeting.

A faculty governance proposal will be brought before the Senate at the next meeting. Kelly will try to get something out to senators before the meeting.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST PODOLEFSKY:

Provost Podolefsky reported that the budget process has not been going well. The Governor's budget recommended a 70-75% funding of the salaries of faculty and staff. It has routinely been 100% in past years. This will leave us about \$1.2 million dollars short. The bad news has gone to worse news with the subcommittee report in the House of Representatives. They have recommended a \$1.6 million dollar permanent budget cut for UNI, then they add back things they want to allocate to us. After they cut us the \$1.6 million, they then give us the \$150,000 MSW. They give us \$330,000 for improving undergraduate education and another \$26,000 for the "opening of

buildings" which is the second half of the Performing Arts Center. It is supposed to pay for additional utilities, etc. The net reduction amounts to \$1.2 or \$1.4 million. That is what is on the table at present. If you add the \$1.2 million shortfall from the salaries and the \$1.2 million dollar base budget cut, it amounts to \$2.5 million. All 3 institutions were cut proportionately except Iowa State was given a fairly large sum for their plant sciences project. The best case scenario we can hope for is the enactment of the Governor's Budget which was still over a million dollars short on salaries. Coincidentally that is about the same amount as the tuition increase. This means that all the things discussed in the budget discussions (strategic initiative) are really a moot issue. The Regents were here for a meeting 2 weeks ago and each of them voiced their concern for the damage to the progress that the institutions have been making, in the strategic planning and re-allocations - that this sort of undermines a lot of that long term effort. Podolefsky says he is optimistic that things will come out ok. He says that it is premature to consider caps on enrollment at this time, nor will we sacrifice the quality of education. Another alternative would be to freeze ongoing searches. All scenarios will be examined. All we can do at this point is weigh alternatives.

Nick Arnold said students are working to have the legislators contacted by parents, alumni and others to voice their concerns over the budget and some students are planning to attend the legislative session tomorrow.

The question of how much of a tuition increase would be necessary to make up the loss of \$2.5 million was asked. It would be approximately an additional 7-10% above the typical 4% increase.

Discussion followed.

Cooper asked if the person had been selected to serve on the Intellectual Property Committee. She would like the name entered in the minutes when we know who it is.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

740 Report of the Calendar Committee

Nelson moved (Utz seconded) to docket this for April 10 meeting.

Motion carried. Docketed as item 656.

We will attempt to put this on the web site. Phil Patton handed out a new calendar schedule. According to a memo handed out, this will add 3 new instructional periods: A 4 week session that will begin in May; a 6 week session May to mid-June; a 6 week session mid-June to the end of July.

741 Request for Changes to Policies for Graduating with Honors

Utz moved (Terlip seconded) to docket in regular order.
Motion carried. Docketed as item 657.

742 Request for Emeritus Status, Charles Strein, Department of Economics

Power moved (Ogbondah seconded) to docket in regular order.
Motion carried. Docketed as item 658.

743 Receive report of the Committee on Admission and Retention

Jurgenson moved (Terlip seconded) to docket in regular order.
Motion carried. Docketed as item 659.

OLD BUSINESS

Report of the General Education Committee

Personal Wellness is wrapping up their report and it should be brought to the senate later this semester. The NCA accreditation process is ongoing.

Dr. Darrel Davis, Chair of the General Education Committee, was invited to address the Senate. Davis pointed out some of the issues that the General Education Committee is working on, or has concern about.

1. A breakdown in some areas of the coordination of courses, especially where those courses are taught by faculty from two or more departments. Where there has been a tradition of coordination, for example Humanities I & II, the coordination effort appears to be sufficient. Where there has not been a long-standing tradition of coordination, for instance, Capstone—Environment, Technology, and Society, the breakdown is more serious.
2. The General Education Program has an image problem. Too many faculty and students demonstrate a lack of appreciation of the program as part of the total undergraduate experience. Also the “connectedness” between categories and courses in the Program. We have done a horrific job of communicating, both to faculty and students, how the Program comes together; how it should be coordinated with major courses; what its role in the total undergraduate experience should be.
3. Davis commented that the grade distribution between sections of the same class in the General Education is often wide. In too many instances the range of grades assigned appears to be unfair to students who register late in the registration period due to their student number. The range of average grade assigned sections of one General Education course is from a low of 1.79 to a high of 2.29 on a 4.00 scale. The mean score over all sections of this class was 2.03. (This information is from the Fall 1999 Grade Distribution Report from the Director of Information and management Analysis.) However, for the same semester the grade distribution for sections of another class ranged from a low of 1.30 to a high of 3.72 with a mean score in all sections of 3.17. This seems totally unjustified.
4. Davis feels that there is no continuity in administration in the single largest academic program on campus. Deans and department heads are responsible for courses and faculty in the program, but when it is time to do such mundane things as keep on file all of the review reports as review categories on a rotating basis when it is significantly important to have continuity of experience, it's not there, due to faculty turnover in terms of election and so on. There is a lot of information available that isn't used through administrative offices. Things like grade reports and class sizes and adjunct faculty in relation to full-time faculty teaching courses. It isn't used because new people coming on the committee aren't aware it exists. People leaving the committee take their paraphernalia with them and it is not left with new faculty.

With respect to the Capstone course, the Committee has decided to suggest the following:

5. Increase the pool of faculty willing to teach the class. It is hoped that faculty from all undergraduate colleges will want to participate.
6. A Summer Institute, possibly next year, for faculty involved with the Capstone course on a basis similar to the Humanities Summer Institute scheduled for this year. Would like, if possible, to tie some kind of requirement, that faculty who are going to teach the Capstone course, must attend this institute.
7. The General Education Committee has committed itself to paying close attention to the Capstone course when Category III is reviewed during the 2001-2002 academic year.

Discussion followed including:

In terms of a lack of administrative continuity, McDevitt encouraged committees to integrate their material into the Faculty Senate files which were set up last year. With the help of the secretary, all these important files can be kept in one place for future use.

Davis acknowledged the help and support from the Provost.

Romanin asked how the Senate could take the information report from the General Education Committee between now and the next meeting or next month, put something together that is more tangible. There should be some action that ought to be taken or specific recommendations that should be made. When we have a report as significant as Gen Ed it is more than just receiving it, there is something that we need to move forward on. McDevitt said we will schedule the Personal Wellness for the meeting of the 24th (April); we will commit to working with the Gen Ed Committee to get a file of materials and to establish that link.

Terlip asked the Senate for help in facilitating discussions to help clear up the communications problem about Gen Ed, among the faculty and students.

Cooper suggested that the Gen Ed Committee look at what they want and let the Senate know and then the Senate could see if they could help.

Ogbondah recommended that the committee look at the QEP report which has many marketing strategies.

NEW BUSINESS

Strategic Plan

Chair McDevitt introduced President Koob, Carol Bodensteiner, Professors Rappaport and East, who are members of the Senate Strategic Planning Committee.

President Koob expressed his appreciation for the effort that has gone into creating this document.

McDevitt said she was gratified to see more emphasis on faculty development and on objectives and

the explication of them that support that in both undergraduate and graduate education.

Bodensteiner thanked Laura and Syed for their active and thoughtful participation and for the ongoing input from the faculty into this process.

President Koob thanked Carol Bodensteiner and the committee for all their efforts. He said he was pleased that they were able to come up with a relatively terse Strategic Plan. If you take a look at the core - the Culture Statement, the Values Statement, Vision Statement and Mission Statement and Goals, there are eight goals and twenty-two objectives spread out evenly across those goals.

Speaking for himself, East said his committee is somewhat disappointed in the Strategic Plan. It is not because everything they recommended was not followed, but there were some good things in their recommendation that were not done. They feel that there is no Strategic Planning Process that has come out of this. It's still up in the air that every five years some committee will magically be appointed and continue the reconciliation process, which nobody understood to start with. East's committee felt that there was good criteria suggestions left out. There is no rationale under the goals explaining how the goals might be reached. There is no plan for implementation and assigned responsibility for who is going to implement it and assess it.

The committee did not feel that the strategic planning process was very open. The meetings of the committee, rather than an open reception of ideas from whoever wished to present them, and by taking a quick look at the results of the plan, they had some suggestive criteria that things ought to be met to be included in the plan. For instance there are goals and then there are things under the goals and they suggested each of the things under the goals have a rationale that explains how they might help reach the goals. The committee suggested that each of those things that get implemented should have a plan for implementation and assigned responsibility for who's going to implement it and assess it and that is not included. They think that each goal should be capable of being assessed and the assessment be specified, and in this case, there are indicators that look like they might be a little better than the previous indicators, but there's no indication of what success is, or who's going to collect the data, when they are going to collect it, what do you compare against? What's successful? They think these kind of things would have made the plan much stronger and would have made getting things done much easier.

Romanin said he assumed that this is still a discussion and opportunity for the committee and cabinet to build on the document. He asked if any of the suggestions and observations made today can still be included in the document.

Bodensteiner said the committee attempted to balance the ability of various units around the University to be able to make decisions and build ways to reach the goals without imposing our thought on it because we figured the people in the University had a better idea of how to achieve the goal than the committee would be able to develop. The document is still very much an open one. The committee presented a draft to the Cabinet, the Cabinet looked at it and provided some fine tuning, specifically adding things like the performance indicators that respond to what the Board of Regents' needs are, what the University's needs for information gathering are. The Cabinet elected to separate the actions and performance indicators into separate documents for a number of reasons. Some actions can be completed, or would be completed momentarily, within months or within a year. Some of them will probably take the entire five years to complete, if not longer. So the actions are much more exemplars of what would be done to achieve the goals and the real need of that would be put on the plan going forward.

Koob reported that the Board of Regents requires that we have a new planning document to them no later than November of this current calendar year. We have some flexibility as to what that document should look like, but it clearly must contain those things that he mentioned earlier - the Culture Statement, the Value Statement, the Vision Statement, the Mission Statement, Goals and Objectives. In addition to that, we are expected to provide a series of performance indicators. The actions whereby we might achieve any one of those goals is really an internal matter, and the rate at which we define success against one of those is an internal matter. What we need to have in place to satisfy the needs of the Board of Regents is particularly the first of the three documents, the document called "A". So what we are asking the Senate to do is to take a look at that and say are there things which you just cannot live with? They're terrible, you just don't want to do them? Let's get them out of there. They're not a good thing. Are there things that must be in there? You are perfectly within your realm of authority to reject the whole thing, but it would be courteous of you to tell us so that we could have a constructive alternative to offer to the Board in November. Koob said that it is very difficult to extend it, how do you make it happen, how do you manage it, how do you set the individual goals within? It is very difficult to do this generically for a university as complex as this one. It does matter a lot how each individual unit might be assigned responsibility and goes forward carrying out its task. The Action Document, for all practical purposes, will not necessarily go to the Board of Regents at all. The intent of this document was to be exculpatory in some way, trying to explain what this objective meant and some sense of where it would go. The element of Phil's comments that Koob agrees with most is that we don't have an ongoing Strategic Planning Process. We are unable to achieve it without the development of a university wide governance structure. The problem is that we have not been able to get our various groups, Student Government, Merit Representation, P & S Representation and Faculty Government around the same table so that we can agree on how we ought to proceed and what ought to go forward. Koob said he had asked some sort of joint process be worked through last year and said individual units did but they were never merged. We fail to have an ongoing process because we haven't found a way to bridge the gap between all the constituencies on campus. Until we can do this we are condemned to repeat the ad hoc nature of going through the planning process. Something needs to occur either one level higher or deeper. The request to the Senate is to particularly peruse Document A and make sure that you moderate it, modify it and we need to have that done in such a way that if there are significant changes from here that they have a chance to be checked with the other constituency groups, because the same requests are made to Student Government and of the Staff groups and we need to reconcile those differences if the Senate does not come up with the same set of recommendations. This needs to be done in a relatively expeditious way because we still have to get something to the Board of Regents by next November. If you care to comment on the performance indicators it would be great. The Cabinet has attempted to be consistent in these. The data is collected by Information Management Analysis, that office takes the information, collects it from around the campus, is the keeper of the data, is the keeper of the benchmark, the benchmark is usually where you are, the goal is set by your objective and the rate is something that we set internally. All we're asked to do by the Board is to provide them with the assurance that we are collecting information of some sort. In other words we are measuring the number of tenure, tenure track faculty that are teaching, so that is the performance indicator as far as they are concerned. We measure quality. We have five year performance reviews, that's a measure of quality. Those of kinds of things we are required to have. The list is not a fixed list. What we've tried to do is minimize the number of new things that would have to be done. We've tried to take the data and governance reports that the Board already receives (from the University) and insert them under each of the goals and objectives in order to create as little new work as possible. There are several levels of ways to move forward from here. It is important not to worry about the whole ball of wax to the point that it paralyzes you in respect to things that have to get done in a timely way. On the other hand, to the degree that you can solve the

issues that are raised for the whole ball of wax we'd be most grateful.

Kirmani asked how the actions proposed could affect the budget allocations. Koob said the budget allocation is made at several levels. The budget process at the University is too long to explain. The intent is that the things that are in here are identified as high priorities to achieve and therefore budget ought to be allocated to achieve them. A point of caution, something that was discussed a lot in the Cabinet, for example there's elements in here for professional development for faculty and staff - very important things to do. Whether or not those occur are a joint responsibility of the faculty and staff and the administration. They are not something that the administration just hands out. Most professional development with respect to faculty occurs as a result of their own initiative with respect to their own scholarly activities and they may, in fact, be funded or not funded depending on the discipline. They may be funded by institution, by granting agencies, by professional associations, so it is a complex set of ways in which to achieve it. Certainly there will be budget implications. We have tried to demonstrate over the last four years, at least, that the current Strategic Plan had budget implications. This is more specific in many ways. For example, the item on child care. If that is accepted by all the constituent groups it is a significant shift in budgetary resources. There has been no initiative to increase or decrease it. Raising it as a strategic initiative within this group clearly will shift resources away from something else. The role of the Strategic Plan at this level within the University is to set a direction, to let the different units work in that direction as best they may. Hopefully the combined joint work will yield a success. It is not a step by step plan to make sure that you get from point a to point b. It is not a road map, it is a setting of directions. With this set, if child care is more important, we need to do more about it. If everyone agrees, then we are in effect mandated to start to increase the number of openings for child care on campus. How we do that and who actually does it may be a difficult task, but we will do it.

Rappaport commented on the goal on culture. He said he looked around the Business School for things he thought were excellent and those that were not. How does one know what is excellent? Should this goal and the culture try to measure things relative to other institutions? How might this be dealt with? Discussion on defining excellence followed.

Chair McDevitt said the Senate does have the prior chair of the Faculty, Ira Simet, who has conducted a process over the last two years to visit with all the groups around, convening or bringing together, developing some way to do this shared governance on some issues. That report is still outstanding but it will come to us at some point.

There was discussion on how to shorten the document. Nelson suggested that if there were not separate indicators for two goals, they are probably not two separate goals and maybe should be consolidated. Utz said it is very important to have the Mission Statement because it is being read by people who are looking at us as a place where they might want to work in the future.

In response to the charge that this is not a Strategic Planning Process, Koob said that we have to share in the responsibility of developing the process and that means, if it is going to represent the whole campus, that you have to include more than just the Senate and that is hard work. If there is something that Koob can do to help things along, that does not usurp the authority of the Senate, he will be happy to do it. However he does not want the Senate to disagree so he has the freedom to make choices.

Weeg acknowledged that in this Strategic Plan the Library is mentioned in an action statement. Yet as an individual library faculty member she has difficulty seeing herself in the plan and asked whether

units not names in the plan are to model their strategic plans on the University's plan. Koob responded affirmatively.

Koob said if the Senate wants to set targets for any of the indicators it would be valuable information. If you debated the target for each goal you would never get it done before the end of April. This has to happen in implementation levels. Are we in favor of the general goals or not? Do we want intellectual vitality or not? Do we want community or not? Do we want to serve people or not? Those kinds of things we have to decide. Do these indicators reflect that? After deciding that, then we can debate the targets. Get some orderly discussion going that's done at a hierarchically level so you make the big decision first.

Power moved (Nelson seconded) that the Senate invite the P & S Council and the Student Government Group to meet with us in a public hearing sometime before the end of the semester at which time our Strategic Planning Committee can report to the group. The President can explain to us his understanding of the plan as well as the Committee.

Discussion. This would not be a meeting to vote, just an informational meeting. Chair McDevitt will initiate and serve as chair of the session.

Motion carried.

Ogbondah said he would like the Senate to recognize and express gratitude to the committee for their work so far.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Chair McDevitt said we will table the rest of the agenda until the next Faculty Senate session.

Jurgenson moved (Kirmani seconded) to adjourn.

Motion to adjourn carried 5:16 p.m.

Meeting was adjourned at p.m.

Prepared by Judy Schreiber